

have watched them struggle and put energy into their fight to achieve democracy, to achieve freedom, and to join us in saying, yes, indeed, we understand freedom isn't free. It does come with a price.

#### COMMENDING CENTURY-OLD BUSINESSES IN NORTH CAROLINA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise before you today to congratulate 13 distinguished businesses in North Carolina's Eighth District that have served their communities and their country for more than 100 years. Not only do these businesses provide valuable jobs in our community, but they also illustrate North Carolina's rich tradition of entrepreneurship and the importance of family-owned businesses.

I congratulate the following businesses for their many contributions: Norton Doors, Moose Drug Company, Eaton Corporation, Mt. Pleasant Hardware & Milling, Efird Marble and Granite, Dunn Manufacturing Company, Coffing Hoists, Woodmen of the World Insurance, Miller Lumber Company of Mt. Pleasant, Wall Safety Products, Pass & Seymour/LeGrand, Tuscarora Yarns, Incorporated, and Bonsal American.

Small businesses like these remain pillars in our community because of their commitment to producing quality products and advancing award-winning customer service. I commend the owners and employees of these firms for their contribution to the American economy and their pledge to producing and selling quality and innovative products.

#### SAFETY AT INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on this House to pass legislation of major importance to my constituents in New York's Hudson Valley. The Indian Point nuclear power plants are located within 35 miles of New York City, making it the largest population in the country that lives within the vicinity of a nuclear power plant.

I visited the plants on January 30 with a nuclear safety engineer from the Union of Concerned Scientists. Afterward, I requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorize an independent safety assessment at Indian Point.

As I saw on my visit, there are many people working at Indian Point who are fully dedicated to ensuring a safe and secure plant. They deserve our sincere

appreciation. But Indian Point is an aging plant with a history of problems, and an ISA is the best way to identify areas of weakness before they become serious issues.

My Hudson Valley colleagues and I have introduced legislation to call on the NRC to commit an ISA at Indian Point. Additional colleagues here in Congress have joined me in this. This would ensure the utmost safety at Indian Point for our surrounding communities.

The NRC needs to put the safety of the residents of New York's Hudson Valley first, and I urge the House to promptly consider and approve our legislation.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4973, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4973) to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, my friend, Congresswoman MATSUI, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

This structured rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution.

It provides that the amendments printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report and offered only by a Member designated in the report. They shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. These amendments shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, the rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, and, as always, it provides the minority with one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation brought to the floor from the Financial Services Committee under the leadership of Coach MIKE OXLEY and Chairman RICHARD BAKER.

Yesterday evening, despite inclement weather, the Rules Committee met and took testimony from Members regarding their thoughts on how to improve this legislation. The committee determined that many of these amendments should be considered and made two-thirds of those amendments submitted to the committee in order, including seven Democrat and bipartisan amendments.

This legislation follows upon sensible reforms of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004, which also sought to update and modernize the National Flood Insurance Program. Although this previous effort at reforming the program was well intended, a number of provisions included in the 2004 act have yet to be implemented.

Also, this earlier effort is currently incomplete because it was passed by Congress before Hurricanes Katrina and Rita devastated the gulf coast and, therefore, did not incorporate the lessons learned from these storms and how best to administer the NFIP.

The Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act makes a number of commonsense changes to current law. Among other things, it does the following: it requires the Comptroller General of the United States to study the effects of extending the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements to all properties located in flood hazard areas and report back to Congress within 6 months on the findings.

□ 1030

It increases the fine levied against federally regulated lending institutions

for each failure to require mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements to \$2,000 and increases the total cap on fines for institutions to \$1 million.

It reiterates FEMA's responsibilities to implement provisions of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 and directs FEMA to continue to work with the insurance industry, State insurance regulators and other interested parties to implement the minimum training and education standards for all insurance agents who sell flood insurance policies, and mandates that FEMA submit a report to Congress on implementation of these provisions.

It directs FEMA to maintain and periodically publish an inventory of levees located in the United States so that these levees can be identified for National Flood Insurance Programs.

In addition to improving and reforming this program, this legislation also ensures that taxpayers are protected, including provisions to establish that nonresidential properties and nonprimary residences will be charged actuarial instead of subsidized rates.

It increases the NFIP's borrowing authority to \$25 billion, but also a requirement that FEMA submit a report to Congress on how it intends to repay funds borrowed under this increased authority.

It requires a semiannual report by FEMA to Congress on the financial status of the National Flood Insurance Program.

It extends the current pilot program for mitigation of severe repetitive loss properties, which is set to expire September 30, 2009, to 2011.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend Chairman OXLEY and Chairman BAKER for their hard work on this legislation. Listening to people, learning from the mistakes of the past and also from the impact of these devastating hurricanes has meant that we will continue our efforts to protect homeowners, taxpayers, while ensuring that a viable market for flood insurance continues to operate effectively and efficiently in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, as the representative of a district in a floodplain, I understand the need for a healthy flood insurance program. My hometown of Sacramento is the most at-risk river city in the Nation. Whenever I talk about our efforts to improve Sacramento's level of flood protection, I also mention the importance of flood insurance. If you live behind a levee, you should have flood insurance.

I also recognize that to accomplish this we need a healthy and robust Na-

tional Flood Insurance Program. That is why the legislation we debate today, the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act, is so significant.

Through this legislation, we will meet our responsibilities. We will ensure coverage is available to those at risk, and we will educate those same individuals as to the benefits of flood insurance. This bill takes us in that positive direction.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the deficiencies in the program were laid bare. What remained was a program \$25 billion in debt with a questionable future. It is imperative that we rebuild the flood insurance program.

For many Americans, owning insurance that protects against a flood is more valuable than in case of a fire. That is because homes in a federally designated special flood hazard area are three times as likely to be destroyed by flood as a fire. This is the case for almost three-fourths of all homes in Sacramento. This is an important program that must be reformed to ensure its long-term stability and solvency.

The bill we are considering today makes reasonable reforms. It will lay the foundation for a stronger and improved flood insurance program. For that, I would like to thank Chairman OXLEY, subcommittee Chairman RICHARD BAKER and Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK for their work on this bill, as well as the minority staff of the Financial Services Committee, particularly Jeff Riley, for all their tireless work.

This bill takes important steps to modernize the flood insurance program. It raises maximum coverage limits to keep up with inflation. It provides new coverage for living expenses if you have to vacate your home, and it also provides optional coverage for basements and business interruption coverage for commercial properties.

These are all positive steps that will allow the program to continue to provide peace of mind to those impacted when a flood event occurs.

Moving forward, Congress is also making the flood insurance program sustainable in the long run. It tightens enforcement of purchase requirements and ends subsidies on vacation homes, second homes and businesses. These steps may not be popular, but the program needs this kind of tough medicine.

Additionally, it directs FEMA to provide Congress with information that will allow us to evaluate whether we should modify the program's mandatory purchase requirements. This is an issue that demands serious consideration, and I know that we will hear further debate on it once this bill reaches conference.

As I conclude, I would like to express my disappointment that an important amendment I offered was not adopted. It would have created an educational outreach grant program to ensure

homeowners in high-risk flood areas retain their flood insurance. This grant program works.

Last year, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, with a FEMA grant, conducted just such a campaign, SAFCA, and reached out to more than 45,000 NFIP policyholders in the American River floodplain with impressive results.

Of this group, 43 percent now carry preferred risk flood insurance. Preferred risk policies provide policy owners who are protected by a levee or other flood mitigation method with full flood insurance at a reduced price. Because of the lower price, the preferred risk policies have a higher level of policy retention.

To put the success in perspective, FEMA more than recouped its investment. SAFCA exceeded its target for policies, retained more than 20 times over, adding millions to the flood insurance program's bottom line.

Extending these grants to other flood plains will only strengthen the National Flood Insurance Program. I will continue to move this program idea forward; and I look forward to working with Chairman OXLEY, Chairman BAKER and Ranking Member FRANK on this grant program.

Ensuring the long-term stability and solvency of this nearly 40-year-old program is critical. The Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act is an excellent step in the right direction. As my grant program demonstrates, there is still more to do.

Having said that, this is a good bill and a much-needed start. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we can enact this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as she chooses to consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule; and I want to thank Mr. SESSIONS, as well as Chairman OXLEY and Mr. BAKER and the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK, for working hard to bring this updating measure to us today.

Madam Speaker, when the Financial Services Committee debated this bill, an issue came to my attention that needed a remedy.

Many States like Florida that have far too many experiences with flooding have established a mediation process for residents who have flood claims. This process gives residents the opportunity to settle a claim dispute with FEMA without having to go to court. Florida has a 90 percent success rate with this process, which other States have actually begun emulating. This process brings quick results to homeowners, saves millions of dollars in court costs and is something that should be encouraged.

However, oftentimes representatives from FEMA refuse to show up, even though the mediation program is non-binding. This is a travesty to residents who have already lost so much.

Accordingly, my colleague and I from Florida, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, introduced an amendment that requires FEMA to participate in State mediation claims. Again, this process is nonbinding. If a resident is unhappy with the results of the proceedings, they may choose to file suit. But the language will ensure that residents have a choice, instead of FEMA making that choice for them by simply avoiding the process.

I urge all Members to give homeowners the opportunity to settle their claims quickly without a team of lawyers and mountains of legal fees. I urge your support for the rule and also the underlying bill so that homeowners living in flood-prone areas will have some certainty.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in the hopes that this rule will be a model that my colleagues will follow. It actually puts in order just about every amendment that ought to be put in order, and I hope that is a precedent.

The bill also represents, I think, the legislative process at its best. We began this a couple of years ago. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is still a Member, and the former Member from Nebraska (Mr. Bereuter) formed a very effective bipartisan coalition to take the floodplain program and to preserve its essence to provide assistance to Americans who could not get it from the private market without this government program.

Let me stress that this is a case where we are putting forward a Federal government program to meet a problem that will not be met by the private market. And for my friends who subscribe to the maxim of the former majority leader from Texas (Mr. Armey) that markets are smart and government is dumb, I guess he would think what we are doing today is dumb, but he is probably the only one in the country who does. Because we are now dealing with a market failure in the economic sense by having a government program, but it should be a sensible government program. It was not as sensible as it should be.

We began a process when the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Nebraska came to us, and this was a collaborative effort between myself as the ranking member and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY). We found one of those cases where you could improve a program from both the environmental and fiscal standpoints, and we have legislation today that takes an important program that

meets a very pressing social need, the ability of people who live in flood plain areas to continue to live and to get insurance at a reasonable cost, and we make it better environmentally, less likely that there will be building in environmentally unwise areas and in unwise circumstances, and we make it less of a fiscal problem with the Federal Government.

Now, clearly, people recognize the problem. In the case of Katrina, we spent a great deal of money and got too little in return. There were some problems there from the standpoint of levee construction and a number of other things. We can't, in a bill like this, obviously, prevent disasters. What we can do is increase our ability to work with them.

So I am very proud of this bill. There is one amendment in particular, and a number of the amendments will get bipartisan support. Our colleague from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), who lived through some of the worst of this personally, has a very important amendment. I strongly advocate for it. I wish he had gotten more than 10 minutes to discuss it. So I am going to talk a little bit about it now. We will talk some more about it in the general debate.

It deals with the problem that homeowners face when they are told that they will not get any compensation for damage if it was caused by water, when they are told that it was caused by water, when they have very good reason to think it was caused by wind.

There is this split. Wind damage is covered by private homeowner policies, water damage by flood damage, by the flood insurance program. There is very good reason to believe that people have not been treated fairly in this situation.

The gentleman from Mississippi, who has been one of the most tireless and energetic defenders of the rights of citizens in this program, has an amendment that would bring to bear the administrative resources to look into this issue. We cannot regulate State insurance, but we can, at the intersection of the Federal fund insurance program, the State insurance, bring to bear our investigative and other resources.

The gentleman from Mississippi's amendment is an essential piece of trying to treat people fairly in the past but, even more, preventing abuses in the future. So I strongly urge people to vote for it.

In general, we have a good bill. There are amendments from both parties that will improve it. There are some amendments that I will oppose on the whole. It is a legislative effort that will make an important program environmentally better and fiscally better and meet, as I said, a defect the private market on its own cannot meet.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to notify my colleague, Ms. MATSUI, that I do not have any additional speakers. I would welcome the opportunity to have her go through those speakers, have her

close, then I will do the same after she is through.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the rule, and I appreciate her interest in dealing with these sensitive issues, given the district that she represents. It was my privilege to have worked with her husband on some of these in the past, and I appreciate her following through, because it is critical to people in the greater Sacramento area.

As we have seen outside our window here in Washington, DC, it is critical to people around the country because flooding is not just something that occurs in storm-racked coastal areas or immediately adjacent to rivers. What we are finding is that there can be flash floods in deserts. We are seeing throughout a four-state region now the havoc that can be wreaked given torrential rain, having the ground soaked, having development that has taken away the natural absorptive capacity as wetlands disappear. This is an issue that everybody needs to be concerned about.

I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, who has been focusing in a laser-like fashion, on these issues, along with the Chair, Mr. OXLEY. We are seeing more progress that has been made in this area in the last 3 years, frankly, than we saw with the late Hale and Lindy Boggs, when the program was first set up. And it is important.

We are talking about areas now in the aftermath of Katrina where people understand, for the first time, the issues. The rule that has been offered up, one where we are going to have a number of amendments in order, which is going to permit an opportunity for us to deal with some serious legislation to try and teach one another about this issue, and to make it better over the long term.

One of the fundamental issues that is going to come up throughout the rules that are before us is who is going to be subsidized under this program. There are those who feel that, well, frankly, we shouldn't rigorously impose the flood insurance program. We shouldn't try to expand the net for people that are involved. We shouldn't make sure that people have flood insurance.

Well, frankly, I think history has shown in the last year that we do people no favors by not having an effective flood insurance program, by not helping people prepare; indeed, to the contrary. What we are doing is we are encouraging more people to be in harm's way. We are allowing some people to

avoid flood insurance, and we are shifting the burden on those who are responsible flood insurance policy-holders.

If we are able to avoid a single 10% unnecessary rate increase, this ripples across to save \$150 to \$200 million for 4 million policy-holders. It is a savings that is compounded over time. So it is \$150 to \$200 million each and every year.

Now, part of the problem of having people who should have flood insurance avoid that responsibility, and we are finding that there are almost a half million properties, vacation homes, second homes, commercial properties, that don't have flood insurance. What that does is that transfers the burden to those that do. It artificially inflates the rate that others pay inequitably.

In addition, it poses a problem because those people that don't have flood insurance that should, well, frankly, it tugs at our heart strings, and we come forward with aid to try and help people after the fact. We are spending billions of dollars that could have been avoided if we had been dealing with an effective flood insurance program, and if we would have implemented some of the initiatives that we brought forward for mitigation to prevent flood damage in the first place.

So, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be involved with the debate today. I join my colleague, Mr. FRANK, in thanking the Rules Committee for allowing a full and vigorous debate. I hope we see more. This shouldn't be the exception. I hope it becomes a pattern.

This is one of those issues that is not partisan. It is not geographical. It is not philosophical. It is one of the things that simply good government, hard legislating, will benefit from a full and vigorous debate on the floor of the House, and I look forward to being a part of it.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I will proceed to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this bill represents an incredible amount of collaboration between Chairman BAKER and Ranking Member FRANK.

This is a very important bill. It makes reasonable changes to the flood insurance program. It will lay the foundation for a stronger, improved flood insurance program. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we can enact this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, as you have heard today on the floor, this rule is fair; it is balanced. It is not an exception; it is a rule. And I appreciate the kind comments that have been made by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about underlying legislation

which will help improve the national flood insurance program.

I want to thank Chairman RICHARD BAKER from Louisiana and Chairman MIKE OXLEY from Ohio for their strong leadership on behalf of this great bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will effect a technical correction in the engrossment of the resolution by inserting "the report of" after "printed in" on page 2, line 9.

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5672, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 890 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 890

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except: beginning with the colon on page 15, line 18, through page 16, line 4; page 24, lines 17 and 18; and section 607. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against language in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such other part and not against the entire paragraph. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 878 is laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 890 is an open rule, and it provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. This resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. This resolution waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the resolution.

It authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. This resolution provides that it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July and provides also that H. Res. 878 is laid on the table.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 890 and the underlying appropriations bill.

H.R. 5672 will fund many of the priorities of this Nation, combating terrorism and crime, strengthening our economy, fostering diplomatic relations and, finally, advancing scientific growth and innovation throughout this country. Each of these priorities is essential to ensure a stronger and a more secure America, and this bill increases funding over last year for almost each and every one of these priorities.

I should also add, to the credit of the committee, under the leadership of Chairman WOLF, that this bill also contains almost \$200 million in savings for our taxpayers. I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his stewardship of this bill.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5672 provides \$22.1 billion for the Department of Justice. That is almost \$724 million above last year, and it is \$1 billion above the President's request.

This \$22 billion includes \$6 billion for the FBI, as they develop and execute better ways to combat terrorism and fight various forms of crime, from child exploitation to gang violence. This increased funding means improved information technology, better counterintelligence capabilities, and a greater number of highly trained human assets on the ground.